

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/588,292	Applicant(s) YABE ET AL.	
	Examiner C. Melissa Koslow	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) C. Melissa Koslow. (3) ____.

(2) Jay Rowe, Jr. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed art rejections. Mr. Rowe suggested inserting the crystal structure of the red phosphor into the claims and pointed out that it is the crystal structure gives the claimed properties. The examples show the same compound can have different properties depending on the crystal structure. The Examiner said she consider this.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/C. Melissa Koslow/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793	
--	--